

Docket No: 21043-90

Lexmark Docket No.: LE9-00-051

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Attn: Board of Appeals; Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on October 24, 2002

Lynne W. Moore
Lynne W. Moore

PATENT

RECEIVED

OCT 31 2002

Technology Center 2600

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: RASCHE, et al.

Serial No.: 09/610,129

Group Art Unit: 2624

Filed: July 5, 2000

Examiner: K. Y. Poon

For: Photoprinter Access to Remote Data

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF

Attn: Board of Appeals
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

Submitted herewith in **triplicate** is an Appeal Brief in support of the Notice of Appeal filed by Certificate of Mail on July 19, 2002 and received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 24, 2002. Also submitted herewith are a Second Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 and a Request for One-Month Extension of Time. A check in the amount of \$430.00 in payment of the \$320.00 government fee for filing the present Appeal Brief and the \$110.00 fee for the Request for One-Month Extension of Time is also enclosed.

Please charge any additional fees required or credit any excess in fees paid in connection with the present communication to Deposit Account No. 04-1133.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Clayton L. Kuhnell
Clayton L. Kuhnell
Registration No. 48,691
DINSMORE & SHOHL, LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8377

1003 #10 11-13-02 J-

Docket No. 21043-90

Lexmark Docket No. LE9-00-051

PATENT

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Attn: Board of Appeals; Commissioner for Patents; Washington, DC 20231 on October 24, 2002.

Lynne W. Moore
Lynne W. Moore

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Rasche et al : Paper No.:
Serial No.: 09/610,129 : Group Art Unit: 2624
Filed: July 5, 2000 : Examiner: K. Y. Poon
For: **Photoprinter Access to Remote Data**

APPEAL BRIEF

Attn: Board of Appeals
Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

The present Appeal Brief is submitted in support of the Notice of Appeal filed by Certificate of Mail on July 19, 2002 and received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on July 24, 2002, and in response to the Advisory Action dated August 16, 2002.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest in this Appeal is the assignee of the present application, Lexmark International, Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals or interferences known to the Appellants, the Appellants' undersigned legal representative or the assignee which will directly effect or be directly effected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal. While the assignee believes there are no other appeals which will directly effect or be directly effected

by or have a bearing on the Board's decision, the following applications of the assignee relating to stand-alone printers are also under appeal: 09/609,891; 09/610,081; 09/610,249; and 09/610,404.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-13 and 15-17 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 8, 10, 14 and 18-19 have been cancelled. A copy of the pending claims is set forth in the Appendix.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENT FILED SUBSEQUENT TO FINAL REJECTION

A First Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 was submitted with the Notice of Appeal filed by Certificate of Mailing on July 19, 2002. The Advisory Action dated August 16, 2002 indicated that the First Amendment will not be entered. A Second Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 is submitted herewith. In the Second Amendment, claims 2-10, 13-14 and 18-19 are cancelled in order to reduce the issues on appeal. The Appendix submitted herewith does not incorporate the amendments set forth in the First Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116, but does incorporate the amendments set forth in the Second Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116. In the event that the Examiner does not enter the Second Amendment under 37 C.F.R. §1.116, a revised Appendix will be provided.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The claimed invention is directed to printer apparatuses and methods for using the same, more specifically in the context of stand-alone printers, such as those adapted to print digital photographs (page 1, lines 2-4 of the specification).

According to independent claim 1, a claimed printer configuration comprises computer readable medium having data, a computer having access to the data on the computer readable medium, and a photoprinter having a selection mechanism. The photoprinter is connected to a communication link that is connected to the computer. The

photoprinter has access to the data over the communication link in response to a user's input to the selection mechanism on the photoprinter (page 3, lines 15-16, page 7, lines 4-29, and page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification).

Claims 2-7 and 9 are each, directly or indirectly, dependent on claim 1 and further define the printer configurations. According to claim 2, the printer configuration further includes a user interface on the photoprinter having a plurality of options which are selectable by a user with the selection mechanism (page 7, lines 20-29 and page 8, lines 1-2 of the specification). According to claim 3, the options selectable by a user with the selection mechanism include downloading files from the computer, uploading files to the computer or printing files (page 8, lines 9-13 of the specification). According to claim 4, one or more files are presented on the user interface (page 8, lines 15-19 of the specification). According to claim 5, the data on the computer readable medium can be digital photographs (page 4, lines 16-17 and page 5, line 29 - page 8, lines 1-2 of the specification). According to claim 6, the data on the computer readable medium can be executable code for running on the photoprinter (page 3, lines 21-23, page 4, lines 17-18, page 8, line 30 and page 9, lines 1-4 of the specification). According to claim 7, the computer is connected locally to the photoprinter (page 7, lines 4-6 of the specification). According to claim 9, the computer is a server (page 11, lines 1-4 and 9 of the specification).

According to independent claim 11, another embodiment of the invention is directed toward a printer configuration that includes a computer having a plurality of digital photographs on a computer readable medium and a photoprinter connected to the computer via a communication link, wherein the photoprinter has means for accessing the digital photographs on the computer readable medium (page 3, lines 15-16, page 4, lines 9-17, page 5, lines 1-11, page 7, lines 4-29 - page 8, lines 1-4 of the specification).

According to independent claim 12, a further embodiment of the invention is directed toward a method for accessing digital photographs, wherein the method includes placing one or more digital photographs on a computer, establishing a communication link between a photoprinter and the computer, inputting a request to the photoprinter by a user, and accessing the digital photographs by the photoprinter in response to the request (page 4, lines 14-20, page 11, lines 1-9 of the specification).

Claim 13 further defines the method for accessing digital photographs of claim 12. According to claim 13, the step of accessing includes downloading the digital photographs (page 10, lines 22-24 of the specification).

According to independent claim 15, yet another embodiment of the invention is directed toward a method for diagnosing a printer, wherein the method includes obtaining a stand-alone printer, establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer, transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer, and diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions (page 11, lines 29-30 - page 12, lines 1-20 of the specification).

Claims 16-17 further define the method for diagnosing a printer of claim 15. According to claim 16, the instructions include content to be presented on a display of the stand-alone printer (page 12, lines 7-8 of the specification). According to claim 17, the method for diagnosing a printer further includes the computer processing user inputs to the stand-alone printer (page 11, lines 29-30 - page 12, lines 1-9 of the specification).

VI. ISSUES ON APPEAL

There are two issues on appeal for review by the Board, as follows:

A. The rejection of claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over the Itoh, U.S. Patent No. 6,034,785.

B. The rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over the Colbert et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,699,494.

VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS

A. With respect to the above-noted issue A on appeal, Appellants concede that claims 2-7, 9 and 11-13 stand or fall together with claim 1.

B. With respect to the above-noted issue B on appeal, Appellants submit that claims 15-17 are independently patentable. The reasons in support of the independent patentability of these claims are set forth below.

VIII. ARGUMENTS

As will be set forth in detail below, the printer configurations and method for accessing digital photographs as defined by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 are not anticipated by Itoh. The methods for diagnosing a printer as defined by claims 15-17 are not anticipated by Colbert et al. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-7, 9, 11-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be reversed. Favorable action by the Board is respectfully requested.

A. The Claimed Printer Configurations And Method Are Not Anticipated By Itoh

The printer configurations and method of accessing digital photographs as defined by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 are not anticipated by Itoh.

1. The Invention

As set forth in claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 the present invention is directed to printer configurations having a photoprinter that can communicate with a computer to access data

(e.g., download, upload or print digital photographs and other files), such as in response to a user's input to a selection mechanism on the photoprinter. As defined by claim 1, for example, a printer configuration comprises a computer readable medium comprising data; a computer having access to the data on the computer readable medium; a communication link connected to the computer; and a photoprinter connected to the communication link and in communication with the computer, the photoprinter having a selection mechanism and having access to the data over the communication link in response to a user's input to the selection mechanism on the photoprinter. Also, in another embodiment, the invention is directed to a method for accessing digital photographs on a computer by a photoprinter in response to a request inputted to the photoprinter by a user.

2. The Rejection

The Examiner asserted that Itoh teaches a printer configuration comprising: a computer recording medium, a server having access to the data on the computer recording medium, a line connected to the computer, and a digital print system connected to the line connecting the server and in communication with the server, the digital print system having a selection mechanism and having access to the data over the line connecting the server and memory in response to a user's input to the selection mechanism on the digital print system. The Examiner contends that the digital print system as disclosed in Itoh is a photoprinter because it is used to print images recorded on a film. Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that Itoh discloses a selection means because Itoh teaches the use of a mouse and display to select background images. Therefore, the Examiner contends that Itoh teaches a photoprinter having a selection means, which allows access to data over a communication link in response to a user's input.

3. The Claimed Printer Configurations and Method Are Not Anticipated By Itoh

The printer configurations and method of claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 are not anticipated by Itoh, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be reversed.

More particularly, as defined by independent claim 1, the claimed printer configuration comprises a computer readable medium comprising data, a computer having access to the data on the computer readable medium, a communication link connected to the computer, a photoprinter connected to the communication link and in communication with the computer, wherein the photoprinter has a selection mechanism and has access to the data over the communication link in response to a user's input to the selection mechanism on the photoprinter. Claim 11 is directed toward a printer configuration comprising a computer having a plurality of digital photographs on a computer readable medium, a communication link connected to the computer, and a photoprinter connected to the computer via the communication link wherein the photoprinter has means for accessing the digital photographs. Claim 12 is directed to a method for accessing digital photographs, the method comprising the steps of placing one or more digital photographs on a computer, establishing a communication link between a photoprinter and the computer, inputting a request to the photoprinter by a user, and accessing the digital photographs by the photoprinter in response to the request.

Itoh discloses a method for creating digital composite image data (e.g., custom postcards) by synthesizing a background image (previously stored as digital image data) and an image read from an original. Itoh further discloses a digital print system, wherein the digital print system consists of a configuration of multiple devices, including: an image input device, a controller, a printer, a display, a memory device, an input device, and a bonding machine. Appellants find no teaching or disclosure in Itoh of a photoprinter as defined by and in the present application.

When the meaning of a term used in a claim is sufficiently clear from its definition in the patent specification, that meaning shall apply. *intermatic Inc. v. Lamson & Sessions Co.*, 273 F.3d 1355, 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics, Inc.*, 952 F.2d 1384, 1388 (Fed. Cir. 1992). As defined by the present application, a “photoprinter” is a “stand-alone appliance for printing digital photographs onto a printable medium,” wherein stand-alone is defined to be a printer that is capable of “processing and printing digital files independent of external host device[s], such as a computer” (see p. 3, lines 15-30 of the specification). Claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 all require such a photoprinter.

In contrast, Itoh clearly teaches a printer configuration (print system 10) that includes a printer 16 that is controlled and managed by, and therefore dependent on, an external controller 14 (see col. 6, lines 4-39, col. 7, lines 54-56, and Figs. 1 and 2). More particularly, Itoh discloses that printer 16 subjects a photosensitive material to image exposure based on a signal synthesized by controller 14. Thus, Itoh fails to teach or suggest a photoprinter, as defined by the present application (i.e., a printer that is capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device, such as controller 14). In fact, Itoh teaches away from the photoprinter required by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 because its digital print system requires a printer 16 that is dependent on controller 14.

Appellants submit that, in making the present rejection, the Examiner selectively determined that the digital print system 10 and one of its devices, e.g., printer 16, are sometimes the same and sometimes different. For example, in order to meet the limitations of the present claims, the Examiner impermissibly picked and chose what devices constitute a photoprinter and what devices did not. In particular, the Examiner combined multiple independent devices of print system 10 (or used the print system as a whole) when desirable

to meet some limitations (e.g., asserting that printer 16, monitor 18, controller 14, and data input devices 22 teach a photoprinter), and treated devices of print system 10 as independent components when desirable to meet other limitations (e.g., asserting that memory/server 20 teaches a computer having access to data on a computer readable medium, wherein the photoprinter is in communication with the computer). Meanwhile, the printer in Itoh is only one of a combination of multiple devices provided to comprise a digital print system, wherein each of the devices in the system depends upon an external controller 14 to manage and operate the entire print system, not just the printer.

Rejection for anticipation or lack of novelty requires, as the first step in the inquiry, that all the elements of the claimed invention be described in a single reference. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *cert denied*, 493 U.S. 853 (1989). In view of the failure of Itoh to teach or disclose a photoprinter, which is defined as a printer that is capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device, Itoh does not teach or disclose each element of claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13. Therefore, Itoh does not anticipate the printer configurations and method for accessing digital photographs as defined by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13.

Accordingly, the printer configurations and method of accessing digital photographs as defined by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 are not anticipated by Itoh, and the rejection of claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be reversed.

B. The Claimed Method Is Not Anticipated By Colbert et al

The method for diagnosing a printer as defined by claims 15-17 is not anticipated by Colbert et al.

1. **The Invention**

As set forth in claims 15-17, the present invention is directed to methods for diagnosing a stand-alone printer. As defined by independent claim 15, a method for diagnosing a stand-alone printer comprises the steps of obtaining a stand-alone printer; establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer; transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer; and diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions.

2. **The Rejection**

The Examiner asserted that Colbert et al teach a method for diagnosing a printer, the method comprising the steps of: a) obtaining a stand-alone printer; b) establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer; c) transmitting commands/requests over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer; and d) diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted commands/requests. The Examiner also asserted that Colbert et al teach the accessing of data of the printer, therein the diagnosing of the printer. Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that Colbert teach a diagram of the controller of a printer, wherein the printer controller processes a print job independent from a host, and therefore is a stand-alone printer.

3. **The Claimed Method Is Not Anticipated by Colbert et al**

The method for diagnosing a printer of claims 15-17 are not anticipated by Colbert et al, whereby the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be reversed.

More particularly, as defined by independent claim 15, the claimed method comprises the steps of obtaining a stand-alone printer; establishing a communication link between the

stand-alone printer and a computer; transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer; and diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions. Claim 16 further requires that the instructions transmitted from the computer comprise content to be presented on a display of the stand-alone printer. Likewise, claim 17 further defines the method to require that the computer processes user inputs to the stand-alone printer.

Colbert et al disclose a combination including a host computer 11, a printer 16 and a communication path (19, 21) between the host computer and the printer. Colbert et al further disclose providing a user of the host computer with a remote replication of a printer operator panel, such that the user may view the replica to access all data available through the printer operator panel at the site of the host computer. In particular, Colbert et al appear to be directed towards allowing a user of a host computer to view and use an operator panel of a remote printer that is either located where it is not readily physically accessible or is obscured from the view of a user of a given host. Accordingly, Appellants find no teaching or disclosure in Colbert et al of a method for diagnosing a stand-alone printer, as defined by the present application.

When the meaning of a term used in a claim is sufficiently clear from its definition in the patent specification, that meaning shall apply. *Intermatic Inc. v. Lamson & Sessions Co.*, *supra*; *Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd.*, *supra*; *Intellicall, Inc. v. Phonometrics, Inc.*, *supra*. As defined by the present application, a stand-alone printer is a printer that is capable of processing and printing digital files independent of external host devices, such as host computer 11 (see p. 3, lines 15-30 of the specification). Colbert et al fail to teach or suggest anything with respect to such a stand-alone printer.

In direct contrast, the remote printer 16 of Colbert et al is not stand-alone as it is dependent on an external host computer 11 to process digital files. In the last Office Action, the Examiner asserted that, because the printer of Colbert et al is disclosed as including a PostScript or PCL interpreter, it taught a stand-alone printer. Colbert et al, however, also disclose that printer driver 55 is running within an operating environment running on host computer 11, wherein the printer driver is used to create the commands (e.g., it transcribes a print job into PostScript format) that can be properly interpreted by printer 16 (see col. 7, line 7, through col. 8, line 62). Accordingly, the printer of Colbert et al is still dependent on an external host device, its host computer 11. Thus, if anything, Colbert et al actually teach away from the invention of claims 15-17. In fact, since Colbert et al are directed to allowing a user of an external host computer to view and use an operator panel of a non-accessible or obscured printer, modifying such a non-accessible or obscured printer to make it stand-alone would be counter intuitive.

Rejection for anticipation or lack of novelty requires, as the first step in the inquiry, that all the elements of the claimed invention be described in a single reference. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., supra*. Further, the reference must describe the Applicants' claimed invention sufficiently to place a person of ordinary skill in the art of the invention in possession of it. *Akzo N.V. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479 (Fed. Cir. 1986), cert denied, 482 U.S. 909 (1987); *In re Coker*, 463 F.2d 1344, 1348, 175 U.S.P.Q. 26, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1972). In view of the failure of Colbert et al to teach or suggest a method for diagnosing a printer that is capable of processing and printing digital files independent of an external host device, Colbert et al do not disclose each element of claims 15-17. Therefore, Colbert et al do not anticipate the method for diagnosing a stand-alone printer as defined by claims 15-17.

Accordingly, the method of diagnosing a printer as defined by claims 15-17 is not anticipated by Colbert et al, and the rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 should be reversed.

4. **Claim 16 is Further Independently Patentable**

Claim 16 recites a method for diagnosing a printer, the method comprises the steps of obtaining a stand-alone printer; establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer; transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer, wherein the instructions comprise content to be presented on a display of the stand-alone printer; and diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions.

Colbert et al disclose providing a user of a host computer with a remote replication of a printer operator panel, such that the user may view the replica to access all data available through the printer operator panel at the site of the host computer. Colbert et al teach that printer 16, rather than host computer 11, determines a new message to be displayed (see col. 24, lines 18-27). In fact, Colbert et al disclose that this is significant (e.g., because it provides a true response of printer 16 to control actions initiated through the replica).

To anticipate, every element and limitation for the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Colbert et al fail to teach or suggest a method for diagnosing a stand-alone printer, wherein instructions comprising content to be presented on a display of a stand-alone printer are transmitted from a computer to the stand-alone printer. In fact, Colbert et al only teach replicating on a host computer content already available and displayed on the operating panel of a printer, such that the host computer

imitates the content displayed on the operating panel of the printer. Moreover, the Colbert et al reference even appears to teach against a computer transmitting content to be presented on a display as it teaches that it is significant that its printer, and not its computer, determines a new message to be displayed.

Moreover, the citations provided by the Examiner in support of the rejection are unavailing. For example, the subject matter disclosed in column 9, line 60 through column 10, line 45 merely describes what is happening on printer 16 when a user is using its operator panel. Therefore, Colbert et al do not support a rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Accordingly, the method for diagnosing a printer as defined by claim 16 is not anticipated by Colbert et al, and the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be reversed.

5. **Claim 17 is Further Independently Patentable**

Claim 17 recites a method for diagnosing a printer, the method comprises the steps of obtaining a stand-alone printer; establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer; transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer; diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions; and processing user inputs to the stand-alone printer by the computer. One advantage to such a method could include allowing the diagnostic functionality to be added without using much of the resources of a stand-alone printer.

Colbert et al disclose providing a user of a host computer with a remote replication of a printer operator panel, such that the user may view the replica to access all data available through the printer operator panel at the site of the host computer. Colbert et al teach that printer 16, rather than host computer 11, determines a new message to be displayed (see col.

24, lines 18-27). In fact, Colbert et al disclose that this is significant (e.g., because it provides a true response of printer 16 to control actions initiated through the replica).

To anticipate, every element and limitation for the claimed invention must be found in a single prior art reference, arranged as in the claim. *Karsten Mfg. Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Co.*, 242 F.3d 1376, 1383 (Fed. Cir. 2001); *Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 927 F.2d 1565, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Colbert et al fail to teach or suggest a method for diagnosing a stand-alone printer, wherein a computer processes user inputs to the stand-alone printer. In fact, the Colbert et al reference teaches just the opposite; it specifically teaches (and points out as significant) that its printer, and not its computer, processes user inputs to the printer. For example, Colbert et al teach that a printer state manager 140 operating via controller 72 of printer 16 processes commands corresponding to user inputs to the printer (see col. 23, lines 65-67).

The citations provided by the Examiner are unavailing. For example, the Examiner cited column 11, line 65 through column 12, line 42 as supporting the asserted analysis. The subject matter cited, however, describes actions taking place on printer 16 via controller 72. Therefore, Colbert et al do not support a rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Accordingly, the method for diagnosing a printer as defined by claim 17 is not anticipated by Colbert et al, and the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be reversed.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons set forth in detail above, the printer configurations and method for accessing digital photographs as defined by claims 1-7, 9 and 11-13 are not anticipated by, and are nonobvious over and patentably distinguishable from, Itoh. The method for diagnosing a printer as defined by claims 15-17 is not anticipated by, and is nonobvious over

and patentably distinguishable from, Colbert et al. Accordingly, the rejections of claims 1-7, 9, 11-13 and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102 should be reversed. Favorable action by the Board is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Clayton L. Kuhnell

Clayton L. Kuhnell
Registration No. 48,691
Dinsmore & Shohl LLP
1900 Chemed Center
255 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
(513) 977-8377

APPENDIX

1. A printer configuration, comprising:
 - a) a computer readable medium comprising data;
 - b) a computer having access to the data on the computer readable medium;
 - c) a communication link connected to the computer;
 - d) a photoprinter connected to the communication link and in communication with the computer, the photoprinter having a selection mechanism and having access to the data over the communication link in response to a user's input to the selection mechanism on the photoprinter.
2. The printer configuration of claim 1, further comprising a user interface on the photoprinter having a plurality of options selectable by a user with the selection mechanism.
3. The printer configuration of claim 2, wherein the options include downloading files from the computer, uploading files to the computer, or printing files.
4. The printer configuration of claim 2, wherein the one or more files are presented on the user interface.
5. The printer configuration of claim 1, wherein the data comprises digital photographs.
6. The printer configuration of claim 1, wherein the data comprises executable code for running on the photoprinter.
7. The printer configuration of claim 1, wherein the computer is connected locally to the photoprinter.
9. The printer configuration of claim 1, wherein the computer is a server.
11. A printer configuration, comprising:
 - a) a computer having a plurality of digital photographs on a computer readable medium;
 - b) a communication link connected to the computer; and

- c) a photoprinter connected to the computer via the communication link, the photoprinter having means for accessing the digital photographs.
12. A method for accessing digital photographs, the method comprising the steps of:
- a) placing one or more digital photographs on a computer;
 - b) establishing a communication link between a photoprinter and the computer;
 - c) inputting a request to the photoprinter by a user; and
 - d) accessing the digital photographs by the photoprinter in response to the request.
13. The method of claim 12, wherein the step of accessing comprises downloading the digital photographs.
15. A method for diagnosing a printer, the method comprising the steps of:
- a) obtaining a stand-alone printer;
 - b) establishing a communication link between the stand-alone printer and a computer;
 - c) transmitting instructions over the communication link from the computer to the stand-alone printer; and
 - d) diagnosing one or more functions of the stand-alone printer in accordance with the transmitted instructions.
16. The method of claim 15, wherein the instructions comprise content to be presented on a display of the stand-alone printer.
17. The method of claim 15, further comprising the step of the computer processing user inputs to the stand-alone printer.